

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 15, 2009, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, and 27-31 remain in this application with Claim 20 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 31 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Paula for the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 31, 2009, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the claims overcome the cited references, but that an updated search would be necessary. No patentability agreement was reached.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated January 15, 2009, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("StarOffice") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("Keene") and further in view of the "Background of the Invention"

section of the instant specification. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "receiving at least one additional piece of personal information into the first document after activation of the privacy option of the first document, wherein the at least one additional piece of personal information entered into the first document is one of the following: when a save option is not available for the first document, removed from the first document as soon as the at least one additional piece of personal information is added to the first document." Amended Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 11, lines 28-35.

In contrast, *Staroffice* at least does not disclose removing newly added personal information as soon as the personal information is added. For example, *Staroffice* merely discloses an "apply user data" check box that enables an author name to be displayed within a properties dialog box. (See *Memo*, second paragraph.) In *Staroffice*, the author name may be removed from the properties dialog box by: i) de-selecting the "apply user data" check box; ii) selecting 'ok'; and iii) saving the document. (See *Memo*, second paragraph.) Accordingly, *Staroffice* discloses author name removal upon a check box selection, save, and dialog box opening process. Thus, *Staroffice* fails to disclose removing newly added personal information as soon as the personal information is added at least because *Staroffice* discloses a selection and save process before any information removal.

Furthermore, *Keene* does not overcome *Staroffice*'s deficiencies. For example, *Keene* merely discloses retrieving information pertaining to an individual user's privilege criteria and determining which information contained in a database may be accessed by a requestor. (See paragraph [0007], lines 3-6.) In *Keene*, when a guest user sends a request for access to an object, a retention system processes the request by extracting the requestor's user ID. (See paragraph [0047], lines 1-4.) The user ID in *Keene* is then matched with predetermined privilege identifications [for the requested object]. (See paragraph [0047], lines 9-12.) Nowhere does *Keene* disclose removing personal information from a document as soon as the personal information is received. Rather, a retention system in *Keene* maintains certain information in a document for display to user's with privileges to access the information.

Combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Staroffice* and *Keene*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose "receiving at least one additional piece of personal information into the first document after activation of the privacy option of the first document, wherein the at least one additional piece of personal information entered into the first document is one of the following: when a save option is not available for the first document, removed from the first document as soon as the at least one additional piece of personal information is added to the first document" as recited by Claim 1. Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, and 27-29 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, and 27-29.

III. New Claim

Claim 31 has been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable over the cited art and that it adds no new matter.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 14, 2009

/D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sem

